

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of November 10, 2009, claims 1-10 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 are amended.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 4 for various informalities.

The Applicant has amended the claim taking into consideration the Examiner's suggestions. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection.

II. Objection To Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Figure 5 does not match the disclosure in the specification.

Figure 5 is amended to correctly reflect the disclosure made in the specification.

No new matter was introduced in making these amendments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 4-6 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Eggers et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,692,058).

Claims 2, 7 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Eggers* in view of *Porambo et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,450,624).

Applicant respectfully traverses both of these rejections.

In relevant part, claim 1 recites a control unit that switches between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predetermined user inputs of the operating unit and a

display unit which displays a message indicating the current mode when said first mode and said second mode are switched by said control unit.

Nowhere does *Eggers* disclose anything pertaining to a control unit that switches between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predetermined user inputs of the operating unit and a display unit which displays a message indicating the current mode when said first mode and said second mode are switched by said control unit. Instead, *Eggers* merely discloses a button, which is used to select the source of an audio signal that is sent to a speaker without disclosing anything pertaining to a display unit. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,692,058, Col. 4, l. 42-51. This cannot fairly be viewed as a control unit that switches between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predetermined user inputs of the operating unit, because *Eggers* only discloses one predetermined user input to select the audio source.

Porambo, similarly, fails to disclose anything pertaining to a control unit which switches between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predetermined user inputs of the operating unit. Instead, *Porambo* merely discloses turning on a diagnostic mode by simultaneously pressing two keys. See, U.S. Pat. No. 5,450,624, Col. 4, l. 49-55. This cannot be fairly viewed as switching between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predefined user inputs because *Porambo* also only discloses a single predetermined user input to start the diagnostic program.

As the current application teaches, by providing a control unit that switches between a first mode and a second mode in response to at least two predetermined user inputs of the operating unit and a display unit which displays a message indicating the current mode when said first mode and said second mode are switched by said control unit, the power to the digital reproducing unit is off while the tuner unit receives the broadcast and sends the broadcast to the

amplifier unit, any delay caused during caused by the initial powering of the digital reproducing unit or loading information from the digital reproducing unit when the digital reproducing unit is selected is eliminated. (See, U.S. Pub. 2005/0090214 Para. [0017]).

Therefore, because *Eggers*, *Porambo*, or any combination of the two fails to disclose or even fairly suggest all of the features of the claim 1, the rejection is improper. Because claims 2-10 depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 1, those claims are patentable at least for the same reasons.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 10, 2010

By: /David R. Metzger/

David R. Metzger

Registration No. 32,919

SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080

(312) 876-8000